




LIBRARY
OF THE
Theological Seminary,
PRINCETON, N. J.

BT 701 .B535 1871
Bersier, Eug'ene, 1831-1889.
The oneness of the race in
its fall and its future

of the

h/l

THE
ONENESS OF THE RACE



Digitized by the Internet Archive
in 2019 with funding from
Princeton Theological Seminary Library

<https://archive.org/details/onenessofraceini00bers>

THE
ONENESS OF THE RACE

In its Fall and its Future.

BY EUGENE BERSIER,

OF PARIS.

Translated from the French

BY

ANNIE HARWOOD.



London:
HODDER AND STOUGHTON,
27, PATERNOSTER ROW, E.C.

MDCCCLXXI.

*Butler and Tanner,
The Selwood Printing Works,
Frome, and London*

The Oneness of the Race in its Fall and its Future.

I.

ORIGINAL SIN.

“But not as the offence, so also is the free gift. For if through the offence of one many be dead, much more the grace of God and the gift by grace, which is by one man Jesus Christ, hath abounded unto many.”—ROM. v. 15.

ON the banks of the Nile and the Euphrates, in the places now solitary and desolate, where once stood famous cities, there are found year by year traces of ancient civilisation. Stones still remain there, covered with inscriptions before which science stands silent, baffled and ignorant; for ages they have kept in their mysterious characters the secret of ancient days, which the future has yet to decipher. Hordes of conquering barbarians have swept by them, looking at them only in dull, savage wonderment. Arabs have pitched their tents around, or slept in their

sheltering shadow, without a thought of the departed greatness of which they are the memorials. But let a few more years pass, and the penetrating eye of some scholar of genius will decipher, in these almost obliterated characters, the history of the first ages of the world. The past will spring in renewed life out of those dark deeps, in which it seemed for ever buried; strange revelations will astonish our descendants; and these stones, mute to-day, will tell to the men of the twentieth century what hopes and thoughts were cherished in the world two thousand years before Christ.

This idea presented itself to my mind, as I was thinking of those great truths of revelation, which lie for ages undiscovered and yet are destined one day to flood the world with light. Such are the truths of the oneness of God, and the oneness of the family of man, written in the first pages of Genesis, and yet ignored through ages of paganism and barbarism, till Jesus Christ came to reveal them anew to the world; such are some of the grand elements of gospel truth, over which a veil has hung for eighteen centuries, and which are only now first apprehended by the human conscience, and recognised as the ideal to which its highest aspirations tend. Who dreamed, in the dark days of the middle ages, of the new lights

which were to arise out of those inspired pages? Who would have thought that in them the modern world would discover not only the charter of spiritual enfranchisement, but the secret of all progress and of all social and political reformation?

The subject we are about to treat has suggested this train of reflection. There is a truth which seems to be the discovery of our age, and which, rightly understood, is, we are told, to throw new light on all the problems of philosophy, history, and social order. This is what is called the *solidarity* of man. By this term is meant that mankind forms one body, not in a figure of speech merely, but as an actual fact; that in his physical, intellectual, and moral nature, man is linked to his fellows by bonds close, intimate, and strong, which need to be clearly recognised. Science affirms that a child who throws a pebble into the ocean produces a vibration which, passing from molecule to molecule, extends to the very ends of the world; and it asserts on good grounds, that the same law of transmission prevails in the domain of intelligence and of will. This is what is meant by the law of *solidarity*.

Now this truth, which is spoken of as new, was eighteen centuries ago contained in the writings of St. Paul; it is the doctrine which underlies and ex-

plains the whole epistle to the Romans; it is the very truth which he, the old Jew, old Pharisee, old sectary, placed in the centre of history as the sole explanation possible of the destinies of mankind.

Let us now enter directly on this great subject, and follow in our study of it the order observed by St. Paul himself. We shall treat first of this truth as we trace it in the FALL, by which we may be led, secondly, to see the operation of the same principle in REDEMPTION.

St. Paul in the opening of his epistle to the Romans boldly faces the universal fact of evil—evil to which he gives its true, Bible name of sin. He describes it in graphic characters; he tears asunder all the veils behind which human pride seeks to shelter itself; he shows the presence of evil, not only in those exceptional excesses and monstrous forms, those unnatural crimes which he brands with such holy indignation, but in the very source of the life, deep rooted in the soul, poisoning all the thoughts, desires, and affections of the human creature, and producing its natural fruits—suffering, condemnation, death.

Whence then, he asks, comes this terrible calamity, this universal evil? Turning to the page of ancient revelation, he does not hesitate to answer that the

one, first, transgression has brought upon us sin, and death its due reward: "by one man sin entered into the world, and death by sin."

This is what is called the Scripture doctrine of *original sin*, a doctrine disputed, ridiculed, attacked by every weapon of scorn and satire, but which I, a disciple of St. Paul, accept without shame or hesitation, not blindly, but with a firm and logical conviction, because to me it seems, of all the proposed solutions of the problems of evil, the only one which recognises all the gravity of the case, which escapes fatalism, which assigns an adequate cause for our misery, while it leaves unshaken that foundation of moral order—human responsibility.

There may be some who repudiate this doctrine with preconceived disdain or invincible repugnance. I would beg them to consider, first, that Paul has some right to be listened to by them, were it only on this ground, that he was one of the greatest spiritual emancipators of humanity. I would ask them to remember further, that if faith has its prejudices, it is at least possible that incredulity may also be prejudiced; that before allowing themselves to be offended by a word it would be well to examine what that word really signifies; and that those who claim the most unbiassed regard for truth ought to be the

last to say, "Can any good thing come out of Nazareth?"

Let us however start with a right understanding, lest we be arming ourselves to fight with phantoms. The doctrine of original sin is often presented in a manner which is widely different from that of St. Paul, and against which conscience rebels with reason. It is said—and here I attack a system which, under the name of imputation, has long ruled theology—it is said, "Man is condemned for the sin of Adam. That sin is imputed to him as his own fault. God visits, judges, condemns in us the crime of our first father. See," it is said, "that child just born; he bears upon him the seal of the first curse, and if he dies unpurified by the waters of baptism he is destined to suffer, some say in eternal death, others the torments of that place known in Catholic theology as purgatory, where he may hope, in the course of years and agès, to expiate the fault which he committed in being born."*

* *Rochelle Confession of Faith*, Arts. x., xi.—"We believe that the whole race of Adam is infected with this contagion, which is original sin and a hereditary vice. . . . We believe also that this vice is truly a sin, sufficient to condemn the whole human race, even little children from the womb of their mothers; and that it is so accounted before God."

If this be indeed that which is intended by the doctrine of original sin, then with all the strength of my convictions I repudiate it. I reject it not in the name of my proud and offended reason, but in the name of my conscience, formed and enlightened by the teaching of Scripture itself. For, if there is one principle which Scripture assumes, and on which it everywhere insists, it is that expressed by the prophet, "The soul that hath sinned *it* shall die"; that every one, in the words of St. Paul, shall bear his own burden; that, as says Ezekiel, the son shall not bear the iniquity of the father before the judgment seat of God, and that the father shall not bear the iniquity of the son; that, in a

Augsburg Confession, Art. xi.—"It is further taught that this evil or original vice is properly a sin, which brings down damnation and eternal death upon those who are not regenerated by baptism and the Holy Ghost."

The old confession of sins with which the Calvinist creed commences expresses in a far more just and striking manner the twofold fact of our original corruption and of our responsibility. "Lord God, Father almighty and eternal, we acknowledge and confess before Thy sacred majesty that we are poor sinners, conceived and born in corruption, . . . and that *we transgress* every day, and in divers manners, Thy holy commandments; by which transgression we draw down upon us, by a just judgment, condemnation, death," etc., etc.

word, every one shall be judged according to his own works.*

It is not imputation which Paul teaches; never does he say that we shall be condemned for a fault in which we had no part, and which we have never knowingly and voluntarily ratified. Against such a doctrine, I appeal to that invincible feeling of justice which God has implanted deep in the human conscience; I appeal to the cry of the Just One on the cross, "Father, forgive them, for *they know not* what they do." I am ready to bow before every mystery too wonderful for me, ready to submit my feeble, faltering reason to the positive teachings of

* Ezekiel xviii. 20.—In opposition to this text the teaching of the decalogue is often quoted: "I the Lord thy God am a jealous God, visiting the iniquity of the fathers upon the children unto the third and fourth generation of them that hate Me, and showing mercy unto thousands of them that love Me and keep My commandments." I would observe that the decalogue is not addressing individuals but a nation: "Hear, O Israel," etc.; that the sanctions of the decalogue are purely temporal, because a nation has not immortality; that the consequences here spoken of are therefore the *temporal* consequences of the sins of the fathers; and that this declaration is strictly in accordance with experience and fact. Ezekiel, on the contrary, takes his stand directly on the moral ground of individual responsibility. There is no contradiction between him and the author of the decalogue; there is simply a difference of standpoint.

revelation; but I cannot admit that God should belie Himself. With Abraham I exclaim, "That be far from Thee to slay the righteous with the wicked; and that the righteous should be as the wicked, that be far from Thee. Shall not the Judge of all the earth do right?" (Gen. xviii. 25.) Take away from me this hope, this faith, this certainty; and I see before me only the arbitrary power of a God who terrifies me; and the gospel, instead of coming as a light to shine around me, good tidings to set my heart at rest, only renders more dense, hopeless, and awful the darkness that weighs upon my soul.

Let us then dismiss this system, and place in contrast to it the true teaching of St. Paul. Mystery there is and must be in a subject like this, but let us not create it where God has made none.

Where then is the mystery? Is it in the existence of evil? is it in the fall of man? But if evil had been impossible there would have been no trial; man would have had no power of choice, no gift of liberty. Take away the liberty of the creature, and what remains in creation? The splendours of the sky and the glories of earth. Hark! the voice of worlds filling the infinite expanse with eternal harmony; the sound of many waters mysteriously moved, swelling and subsiding on our shores; the chant of the wind

in primeval forests; the murmur of life thrilling all animated nature. See! light flashes in the sombre vault of silent night; the innumerable host of stars appear; the sun stretches long fiery fingers on the far horizon, then comes forth in his glory, and sheds floods of light and heat over awakened nature; mountains mirror themselves in quiet lakes; rivers flow on, carrying freshness and life; earth becomes a garden of beauty and sweetness. There is all nature endowed with eternal youth and sovereign beauty. Yes: but that nature wants an interpreter, that temple a priest, that concert a voice coming from a free and loving heart, and saying, "Glory to God in the highest!" This was to be the part of man, made in the Divine image; without man all was passive, inert, in nature, and God received only an unreasoning and necessary obedience. There was wanting the intelligent, loving, willing being, who in the full possession of liberty should respond to the love of God.

But how can we conceive of liberty without an ordeal, without the possibility of a fall? Man in the ordeal fell; being free, it was in his power to do so. The mystery is not there. The mystery is here, expressed in the three following questions. How could God, who is good, and who knew what would be the issue of the trial, ordain and will it?

How could God, who is merciful, after the trial, allow humanity to grow and develop itself?

How could God, who is just, permit that, in consequence of the sin of our first father, we all should be born sinners and inclined to evil?

These are the questions which I wish to answer; not indeed that I can pretend to remove all mystery, but that I believe the Divine word sheds at least light enough upon their darkness, to satisfy our consciences until the day when God will justify His ways to men, and reveal Himself fully to those who, in spite of appearances, have held fast faith in His righteousness and love.

II.

ONENESS IN THE FALL.

“If through the offence of one many be dead, much more the grace of God and the gift by grace which is by one Man, hath abounded unto many.” —ROM. v. 15.

WE have proposed three questions dark and difficult, bearing on the fall of man. In reply to the first two we say, God could undoubtedly have prevented the trial which was to be so fatal in its issue. He could after the fall of man have destroyed mankind in the germ. Since He did not do so, what can we conclude but that in His design, and in actual fact, good was ultimately to triumph over evil? This is the teaching of St. Paul, for placing in the one scale the fall of man with all its consequences, and in the other redemption, he makes the balance incline in favour of the latter. “If by the sin of one all are dead, much more the grace of God and His free gift, shall be bestowed abundantly upon all, by the grace of one Man—Jesus Christ!”* (Rom. v. 15.)

* This rendering, while it appears less literal, is really more faithful to the sense. The word *many* in the authorized

Is not this the significance of the prophetic declaration given at the gates of Eden, that the seed of the woman should bruise the serpent's head? (Gen. iii. 15.) Thus from the beginning God held out to guilty and fallen man the hope of salvation. It is not true then that the curse was final and unconditional. Blessing was still bound up with it. The primeval decree, "Be fruitful and multiply, and replenish the earth," received its fulfilment; and the mother beholding her newborn child, and reading in its smile a reflection of the Divine goodness, still said like Eve when Seth was born into the world, "I have gotten a man from the Lord." There was blessing in the trial itself, in the weary sweat in which man toiled, in the tears which watered the upturned furrows; and the earth, beautiful still in spite of the thorns and thistles which covered it, spoke to man of the watchful care of God. It is hard, I know, and to mere human reason impossible, to see the greatness of the reparation which is to balance, nay to outweigh, the griefs, iniquities, burdens under which humanity groans. It is not in the

version points to a limited number, while the original word (*οἱ πολλοί*) puts the plurality of mankind in contrast to the one man.

midst of the battle, in the field reeking with the slain, in the smoke of artillery, and among the cries of the wounded and the dying, that the results of victory can be appreciated: but in this conflict victory itself is certain; it will be the sure close of this long drama, of these anxieties, distresses, cruel vicissitudes under which our souls bleed. Let us remember also that from the depths of our ignorance and littleness we cannot measure the purposes of God. We see only chaos and confusion; He to whom a thousand years are but as a day sees the final issue. For more than fifty centuries men watched the starlit sky, noted the changes of the planets, and endeavoured to discover the laws which governed their movements; they took careful observations, made elaborate calculations, and yet the law of the harmony of the heavens remained a mystery. The stars were still supposed to follow fantastic circles which no rule of science could explain; their orbits formed a labyrinth of which the most learned failed to find the clue. One day a man of genius said: "The sun and not the earth is the centre from which the worlds must be regarded." At once the harmony appeared, planets and their satellites moved in regular orbits, the system of the universe was revealed. God is the sun and the true centre of the spiritual world;

only in the light in which He dwells can the destinies of man be truly read.

Much has been gained, however, when we can once believe in the final victory of God, in the ultimate triumph of good over evil; but if this suggests a possible solution to the questions why God permitted the possibility of evil, and why He did not at once annihilate sinful humanity, it yet leaves in all its obscurity the third question: why the just God should have allowed us all in consequence of the first fall to be born sinners and inclined to evil. This is the most terrible mystery of all, one before which reason falters and fails. I have already said that we are not condemned for a sin in which we had no part; that we are called each one to pass through our own personal ordeal; but in that ordeal do we not ourselves fall one by one? Sin, before it is translated into act, exists as a tendency in us all, we bring with us into life a corrupt and vitiated nature. It is both a false and superficial view of the case to say, with Pelagius, that we sin only through the force of imitation, and that apart from the influence of example we should remain innocent. Experience, in harmony with Scripture, attests that we have by inheritance a leaning of soul to that which is evil. Before we put our own

lips to the cup of poison, the poison itself is already in our veins. How is this fact to be reconciled with the righteousness of God?

To this question there is one answer ready and easy—the denial of the fact itself. *Men are born good*, say some; *men's inclinations are at birth equally balanced between good and evil*, say others. We ask, is either assertion true?

Man is born good. I can conceive such a statement flung as a challenge to Christianity in the intoxication of pride, self reliance, blind confidence in the future, which characterised the eighteenth century in France, and which was to be followed by such a fearful disenchantment. I can understand it on the lips of Rousseau, that illustrious and unhappy dreamer, who, while elaborating his theory of human goodness, was ever ready to see an enemy in every brother man. Man is good, it is said; it is society which spoils him; and visionary pictures are drawn of the simple son of nature amid the fair Utopia of the Happy Isles. Society alone is to blame. Strange sophism! as if society could be something different from the sum of the individuals composing it! as if all the members of the body being sound, disease was explained by attributing it to the body itself as a whole! I know the reply commonly given. We are

pointed to childhood in all its innocence, simplicity, purity, and asked, where is the evil, the corruption, in such souls as these?

There does indeed seem to linger in the unconscious depths of a child's eyes some reflection still of a world unstained by sin; and when I look into them I am reminded of the saying of the Master: "Except ye become as little children, ye cannot enter into the kingdom of heaven." But did the Lord Himself, who uttered those words to read to us a lesson of childlike trust and humility, ever teach the goodness of human nature? If the child is good, why is the training of its moral nature accomplished with so much difficulty? Why does it need so hard a struggle, such persevering efforts to eradicate pride, envy, selfishness, from the heart and life? Where can we find the man who is good? In what unknown country has he found a hiding place? When did he live upon our earth? I might appeal to the experience of all past ages, and challenge the testimony of history to the natural goodness of man. But let us rather turn to the witness of conscience. Man is good! Who says so? Man himself. Strange verdict, in which the accused constitutes himself his own judge. But for a moment let us accept it. You believe yourself to be good by nature, by instinct;

but by what law do you judge yourself? Is it by the standard of the world's morality, made in its own image and satisfied if it can save appearances? Is it by the holy law of the gospel, to which your conscience is forced to subscribe, because you know well that if there be a God He cannot demand of you less than that law demands? You have, we will suppose, studied yourself in this light, and found that you are good. You are prepared to lay open the secrets of your soul, the depths of your inner life, to cast aside every veil, and invite the most searching gaze into your hidden thoughts. You know the law of purity, and your heart spontaneously obeys; the law of love, and your response is prompt and intuitive. To do good is to you as natural as for water to find its level, for the sailing ship to run before the wind. Let all this be granted; but then suffer me to say, You are to me an extraordinary spectacle, a prodigy of humanity; I can scarcely believe that you belong to the same race with myself, for in my soul I see the dark reverse of so fair a picture; I discover such depths of misery within, such obstinate resistance to the Divine law, that my spirit can find full and fitting utterance only in a cry for mercy and pardon.

But of what account is my testimony? Human-

ity need not be gauged by the measure of my soul. Let us then look further and higher. Let us leave this region of moral mediocrity, so thickly populated, and seek out the *élite* of human kind. We will hear on this point the testimony of pure and holy souls, who have left a track of light as they passed through the world, who have wrought miracles of love and self sacrifice among their fellows, and as we look on whom it would seem possible to believe in native goodness. Find me among these one who avows that he has derived from his own nature the heroism which astonishes and humbles us. Do you not know that, on the contrary, the more holy men have been, the more deeply they have felt their misery, their incurable weakness? The deepest, most pathetic confessions of sin have come from those whose lives appeared most completely under the influence of good. From the depths of a heart overflowing with love and self sacrifice, Paul calls himself a miserable man, the chief of sinners ; it is only self complacence, shutting out the all searching light, that can make any pretence to native purity. We are prone to evil. This is the cry of the human conscience.

I know well that in our day an attempt is made to weaken the force of this admission of the conscience, by giving it a natural explanation. Guilt,

it is said, is a generous illusion arising from the following fact. Man is in part of animal nature, but he has within him an ideal law which is one day to be realised. As however it is only possible for him to rise by degrees to the fulfilment of this law, he is painfully conscious of failure, and groans over the distance which yet divides the real from the ideal. This regret he calls repentance. Evil in its essence is only imperfection, not the consequence of a past transgression. Repentance is not the expression of real culpability, but the dim and vague presentiment of a vast progress yet to be accomplished.

This explanation I repudiate in the name of humanity. It contains a sophistical confusion of two moral facts, very distinct from each other, and which we do not in reality confound—the consciousness of a fault committed, and the consciousness of progress yet to be accomplished. It is a mere trick of argument to treat these two as one and the same. Repentance is something essentially distinct from the simple desire to advance, to attain to a higher degree of progress. The child feels no repentance for his lack of manly strength; the schoolboy is not penitent because he does not possess the learning of the master. We can conceive of moral progress carried

on without the admixture of evil at any stage. Such was the human development of Jesus Christ. He increased in wisdom, in knowledge, in obedience, and yet never knew either sin or repentance.*

Our own experience is utterly different. As far back as memory can reach, we are conscious of having violated a righteous law; we are not imperfect only, we are fallen.

We are born in sin; this is the bitter confession we are bound to make, this is the true starting point of all religion.

And here we reach the very heart of our subject. WHY ARE WE BORN IN SIN? St. Paul replies: "By one man sin entered into the world." He asserts the law of *solidarity* in the fall—a mysterious, amazing law, but one without which the Christian revelation has neither unity nor meaning.

However repugnant this positive declaration of Christianity may be to human reason, experience attests its truth.

See that newborn child. He is innocent of all

* "Jesus grew in wisdom and in stature, and in favour" (Luke ii. 52). "Though He was a son, yet learned He obedience by the things which He suffered" (Heb. v. 8). "For their sakes I sanctify Myself" (John xvii. 19).

our faults; he has never gone astray; he does not even know as yet good from evil. But in that childish frame there is sown the seed of disease; it is there, waiting only to develop itself; and in the consumptive tendency, in the unsound constitution, you recognise a fatal inheritance which he will carry to the grave.

Sometimes the intellect will show from its first awakening predispositions so strong that nothing can change them. Sometimes there appears the fatal transmission of moral obliquity, and the mother will start as she sees the early development of a tendency to hereditary vice.

Look at that man! He was born like yourself, strong for the conflict of life; possibly a great future opened before him. But from the cradle he has had to carry the burden of a father's shame. He bears a name not of his own choosing, and the disgrace of that name will so cling to him, by no fault of his, that it will take a whole lifetime of honest struggle to recover the simple right to the respect of his fellows—that first necessity of social intercourse. Look yet again. There is a man whose soul is capable of as noble ambitions, as generous impulses, as your own. But poverty has crushed him with its weight, assailed him on every hand with its temptations to cunning,

lying, meanness ; his eyes opened on scenes of sin and immorality, and from his very birth he has breathed a vitiated atmosphere. Am I seeking out exceptional cases to serve my purpose? Would God these were exceptions ; but what if we find whole races characterised by peculiar, strongly marked, hereditary features, so powerful in their influence that they almost inevitably forecast the life of the individual? Is there not something in the physical and moral constitution of the Indian, the Turk, the Arab, which makes their absorption into stronger nations almost a necessity? How can we then accept that superficial philosophy, which pretends to explain the destiny of the individual apart from the family, the race, to which he belongs. The law of *solidarity* pervades all history. You may reject it if you will, when it is presented by the Bible ; you cannot efface it from the record of experience. It asserts itself in that complex fact, that strange combination of matter and spirit, which is called temperament, by which races are distinguished. It is plainly to be read in the sufferings under which nations groan age after age, in consequence of the crimes of long buried ancestors. It sets its seal alike on the history of the world and on that of the humblest individual ; it is written in the blood in our veins, in our most

ineradicable and secret instincts. Let us not then charge the God of the Bible with foolishness, since all nature joins in proclaiming the same principle.

III.

FATALISM OR FREEDOM.

“If through the offence of one many be dead, much more the grace of God and the gift by grace which is by one Man hath abounded unto many.”—ROM. v. 15.

IN view of the grave and undeniable evidences of the oneness of mankind, in its fall and in its future, baffled reason has but one resource, namely, to embrace a system which shall relieve man of his responsibility. To arrive at this result, two explanations are proposed, both of which admit the facts we have adduced, but absolve man by denying his culpability.

One party tells us that the moral ideal is a mere illusion ; that morality here below is not absolute, but relative, and contingent on time and place. Such is the view maintained by such writers as Renan,* Scherer, and Sainte Beuve, and advocated by them in very specious and attractive language. If this idea be true, if, as M. Sainte Beuve says, morality is in

* M. Renan makes large use of this theory, in his estimate of the character of Jesus Christ.

course of development and gradual renovation, and that which Christianity speaks of as human corruption is only the normal and necessary elementary condition, then doubtless human responsibility has no reality or meaning.

Popular as this idea has become in some quarters, I confess myself unable to grasp it. It is easy to talk vaguely of an expansion of morality; but when we come to apply the notion to definite duties, it proves a fallacy. Will the time ever come, I ask, when we shall have risen to a higher morality than is contained in the law of God? or can any change of place or condition so alter our moral obligations, that it will be lawful for us to love God or our neighbour less than the gospel enjoins? Can any lapse of ages make truth and justice other or less obligatory than they are? To me, the ideal of justice, holiness, and love, of which the gospel is the highest expression, appears unalterable and eternal. I may be tempted to lower its standard, so as to render my life more easy and conscience more compliant; and judging from the laxity of public morals, such a course cannot be unfamiliar to our age. But in the interests of truth, I would rather say, with Adolphe Monod: "Save first the holy law of my God, after that you shall save me." This is the true

language of an upright conscience. Let the law of God be upheld, though I be condemned ; for in the day when that high ideal shall be impaired, the hopes of humanity will perish.

We have yet another hypothesis to examine. The fall of man is declared to have been a fatal necessity. The facts we have mentioned are received, and a system is built up upon them. Man, we are told, is not free ; he is born with strong predispositions ; innumerable hereditary influences combine to make him what he is ; he must not therefore be condemned, for he is not responsible.

In this fatalism we have the explanation of evil given by all antiquity, and which Plato himself expressed in magnificent language, when he taught that the soul, fallen from a higher sphere, is enslaved to matter in a bondage which cannot be broken. But Plato's theory has been refuted long ago. It is false, that evil has its source in the senses only ; it is false, that the misery we suffer rises wholly from those inferior portions of our nature to which Plato assigned it ; it often proceeds from the higher regions of the intellect and the heart. Envy, hatred, pride, are not the fatal productions of matter. Christianity, with a more piercing eye than ancient philosophy, has penetrated into the depths of our moral nature,

and shown us all the elements composing it equally inclined to evil. Far from representing the body as the fatal cause of all our ills, and teaching, like all Oriental religions, that the annihilation of the body is the condition of the enfranchisement of the soul, the Gospel holds out the promise of salvation, sanctification, and immortality to the body as well as the soul.*

Fatalism in our day assumes a more exact and scientific form than in the Platonic philosophy. There exists among us a numerous, enlightened, and influential school, whose severely scientific methods attract many minds, not prepared to acquiesce in its conclusions. This is the positivist school, which affirms that moral freedom is a mere illusion. In order to prove this assertion, it employs the arguments

* It is by a perversion of the Christian idea, that that false asceticism has crept into the Church which condemns, or at any rate contemns, the body. Christianity proclaims the sanctification and resurrection of the body; it speaks of it as the temple of the Holy Ghost. The apostles vigorously opposed Oriental asceticism. It is true that the gospel everywhere condemns the *flesh*; but all who are familiar with the language of the New Testament, know that this word there signifies, not the body exclusively, but the whole nature subject to sin; thus sinful dispositions, though purely spiritual, such as envy, hatred, pride, and malice, are there spoken of as the fruits of the flesh.

of another school—the materialistic—with which it is often confounded. It says: Positive science recognises only matter, the movement of which produces successively life, reason, volition. What we call volition is therefore the result of a motive force. At all events, in this concatenation of causes and effects, there can be no place for that metaphysical hypothesis which is called moral freedom. Moral freedom, therefore, like other transcendental hypotheses, must be consigned by science to the limbo of philosophy.

The positivist school ignores all freedom of action, and by the mouth of one of its most eminent apostles (M. Littré) declares that man acts always under the influence of a determining cause. Unquestionably this is true; we are far from asserting that man's will acts without motive cause, but we draw a distinction between these motive powers; there are some which constrain us, others which we are consciously able to resist, so that if the balance inclines to their side it is our will that so inclines it. The positivist school admits no such distinction; it recognises no measure of freedom in human will or action. "Man," says M. Scherer, "forms part of a vast system; he is the subject of influences, which he in his turn transmits. He is conscious of the influence of which he is the agent, not of that of which he is the object.

He is conscious of being a cause, not conscious of being an effect. Hence arises in his mind the illusion of freedom.

The positivist school treats with great contempt that which it calls the Utopia of moral liberty. It regards it as contrary both to science and history.

Science, which recognises only matter and force, cannot admit into its domain an exceptional, unique, eccentric phenomenon, which asserts for itself independent action. History itself is made to demonstrate that there is no such thing as liberty. Mr. Buckle, in a book of which Stuart Mill says that it has produced a complete revolution in the science of history, brings forward abundant statistics to establish this fact. Here, for example, is a murderer. You, the moralist, look into the soul of the man; you see him led on by vengeance or greed of gain, then arrested by the fear of discovery, or by horror of the crime; you watch this spiritual drama, this tempest of the brain, as it has been called. In the reluctance, remorse, terror, anguish of the criminal, you find proof of his freedom of action. Pure imagination! replies Mr. Buckle. Every year, in every country, there are so many murders. They may be counted upon as regularly as the seasons and the tides. Not only can the number of murders be exactly computed in

advance, but the mode of their execution. So many victims will fall under the hatchet, so many by the knife, so many by pistol shots, so many by poison. Every one of those determinations, which seem to us spontaneous, is thus the result of causes which can be tabulated with mathematical precision.

On these premises Mr. Buckle has written a History of Civilization in England, in which he proves that it owes nothing to so-called moral causes, and that the transformation of warfare by the invention of fire-arms, the development of commerce, the creation of means of communication, steam, electricity, have done more for the amelioration of the race than all religious or humanitarian principles and systems. This assertion is not new to those who are acquainted with the writings of Auguste Comte, the father of positivism. We know in what contempt he held the theory of moral freedom; but he was consistent enough to treat political liberty in the same summary manner, and his dream was of a new theocracy which, in the name of science, should govern humanity, and hold in check the dangerous freaks of individual freedom. On this point M. Littré differs from him; but while this inconsistency does honour to his nobility of soul, it is fatal to his logic. To me nothing appears more dubious and untrustworthy than the

political liberalism, which is based upon the denial of moral freedom. Of what avail is it to break my chains, if you still leave me the wretched slave of fatality?

But what becomes of morality on this system? M. Littré assures us that it is in no danger, and makes good his position by the following reasoning: The essence of morality consists in the idea of good and evil; now this idea can exist apart from freedom of action. Animals possess no freedom, and yet we pass moral judgments upon them. We speak of the goodness and faithfulness of the dog, the cunning of the fox, the ferocity of the tiger. Men are good and evil in the same way; they are so by instinct, and by no choice of their own. Is education then impossible? No, says M. Littré; we educate the animal races, we cultivate plants. Now, to discover the true method of educating man is the problem for positive science, which will then proceed by sure steps, repudiating all the fallacies known as moral freedom, repentance, conversion, and so forth.

Here then is a new system of morality. It is not wanting in clearness; nevertheless, we may not be prepared at once to accept it. We must however at least admit that it teaches modesty. The positivist school has more than once ridiculed that Christian

virtue known as humility, as unworthy of man's dignity. To us it seems that not a little humility is needed, before we can accept the position assigned to us in this philosophy. To place the vicious man on a par with the tiger or the viper, and the good man on a level with the faithful dog; to affirm that between the two species there is no difference of responsibility, is certainly to assume bold and original ground, but ground which all experience, all true knowledge of human nature, proves to be unsound. Do not all great moralists, all true readers of the human heart, give the lie to such a theory? When Shakspeare represents Macbeth yielding to the spirit that haunts him, opening his heart to temptation, admitting the thought of perfidy and murder, then seeking in vain the slumber that flees his guilty couch, visited in ghostly visions by the shade of his victims; when Lady Macbeth, the terrible type of criminal ambition, passes before us, trying in vain with convulsive movement to efface the blood-stain from her hand that all the water of ocean cannot wash away; when Racine reveals to us in Nero the terrible progression of sin in the human heart: do we feel that this is all idle declamation, that the actors in these tragedies are only wild beasts who have no power to change their nature? When,

rising yet a step higher, we listen to a voice choked with the sobs of agonizing repentance, when we see a man's whole soul shaken in the tempest of conversion and emerging from it a new creature, hating that which once he loved, loving that which for a whole lifetime he had hated; is this illusion, a baseless dream? But why do I ask? repentance, regeneration, a new life—science ignores them all. Humanity has been deluded, and positivism will undertake its education upon new principles.

Can we read such declarations as those of the positivists without being struck with the fanatic determination with which science of this order sets itself in our day to abase humanity? Once men were intoxicated with pride, and no anathema could be terrible enough for Christianity, when it dared to speak of moral servitude, of the slavery of sin. Christianity, which never flatters, did indeed so speak, sounding unshrinkingly the depths of our misery, showing the terrible power of evil over man; but did it ever quash the feeling of responsibility? did it not, even while it condemned, call us to repentance, and set before us the royal dignity with which God invests His redeemed? I cannot see the youth of our schools applauding these degrading theories of positivism, without quailing at heart for the future.

These then are the rising educators of humanity; these the champions of progress and emancipation! I call to mind the fathers of modern freedom, the obscure men who awoke to the consciousness of something within, greater than the might of Cæsar, something called conscience, over which brute force had no power. But if this liberty has now to be surrendered, if science and morals are alike to recognise but the one law of force, what are we preparing for ourselves but a return of despotism in theory and practice?

We are responsible. Such is the second confession of the human conscience. We may try to stifle it, but in vain. In vain I attempt to deny the evil I have done; in vain I throw the blame on circumstances; in vain I seek, like the first sinner, to charge God Himself as its cause. An inexorable voice confounds my sophisms, and stamps my crime the act of my own will.

What shall we say then? On the one hand, experience, that cannot be denied, declares that I am by nature a sinner and inclined to evil. On the other, conscience, not to be silenced, tells me that I am responsible. What can be done but accept these two facts, follow these converging lines, though their meeting-point be hidden in depths beyond our sight, and, remitting to God the explana-

tion of the mystery, remain at least faithful to the truth we know? This is the one safe position for the Christian; it is to this the teaching of revelation points. Can we go beyond it? Has human reason discovered the solution of this problem? I think not; but I may say a word here of the systems which have attempted its solution.

These systems may be reduced to two. The one assumes the *pre-existence of individual souls*.* The other supposes that, before entering upon our personal existence here, we shared a sort of *collective life in Adam*, and that in him we actually fell.

Some proceed then on the theory that, before entering on our earthly life, we have passed through an individual ordeal in an anterior state of existence, and that this ordeal having issued in a fall, accounts

* The former of these systems was in the first instance maintained by Origen. In our day it has been again brought forward in M. Julius Müller's remarkable book upon sin. The latter theory, expounded by M. Charles Secretan, one of the deepest and most original thinkers of our day, in his work on liberty, has been brilliantly discussed by M. E. Naville in his treatise on the problem of evil. This system is the reproduction in a philosophical form of an idea which, from the time of St. Augustine, has been embodied in the theology of the church. St. Augustine, misled by an erroneous translation of Romans v. 12 (*in quo*, translation of ἐφ' ᾧ), assumes that we have all sinned in Adam.

for the condition in which we are born into the world.

I am fully conscious of the grand and earnest elements in this theory. But I may remark that it only removes the difficulty a stage further back, without resolving it. If all the individuals composing humanity have fallen in a previous state of existence, we are constrained to ask what led to such an issue. It could only have been that they all yielded to an evil inclination; and the question at once arises, why did they so yield? The real problem then remains obscure as ever.

Of this difficulty one only solution is possible. It may be said that in the anterior ordeal all did not fall; that those who passed through it victoriously have entered on a higher sphere, and earth has become the abode of the fallen only. This was the teaching of Origen, but so bold a speculation is unsupported by any statement of Christian revelation, and is opposed by one decisive fact. The humanity with which we are familiar here on earth is not a fortuitous association of individual souls, which, having passed through their ordeal elsewhere, are here met as in a place of expiation. It is one family indissolubly bound together, every member of which is the heir of all who have gone before. Origen's

theory is in truth the negation of the fact of the oneness of the race. This is a sufficient argument against it.

The second system is sustained by the greatest names of theology—St. Augustine, St. Thomas, Calvin, and Bossuet. It asserts that, before entering on our existence as individuals, we really lived in Adam by a collective life, that in him we underwent our trial, and in him we voluntarily fell.

What does this mean? Is it the assertion of the collective life of humanity? Does it signify that *solidarity* is a fact, and that we cannot as individuals separate ourselves from our race? If so, I accept it fully, and all that I say here tends to establish its truth. But if it is meant to maintain that, before entering on our existence as individuals, we had a *conscious and moral* existence in a collective and specific form, I hesitate; and before admitting or refuting the hypothesis, examine if there is anything within me which justifies it. What is meant by this fall to which I was a consenting party, before I had entered on the possession of a free and individual life on earth? What is that collective and vague existence, in which I am said to have performed, with knowledge and consent, an act which determines all my destiny? Hard questions these, which, so far

from throwing light on the problem of the origin of evil, themselves require to be rendered intelligible. Without casting any slur on the adventurous researches of others in this mysterious domain, I revert rather to the two undeniable facts of individual responsibility, and the oneness of the race in the fall, which Scripture and experience alike attest. I know not if *we were in Adam*, but I know well that *Adam is in us*, and that no son of his race can repudiate the inheritance derived from him. I accept the statement, of the Christian revelation, that one transgression has involved us all in a common fall, and that this fall does not cancel our responsibility.

But this is the very conclusion declared to be inadmissible by reason. It is this law of *solidarity*, which so many regard as immoral and objectionable. It is this law we are called upon to explain. Is such an explanation, it may fairly be asked, possible to such minds as ours? But if I am able to show you aspects of the law of solidarity which you have not perceived; if I am able to prove to you that without this law there is nothing grand, nothing beautiful, in society or humanity—that without it neither society nor humanity would be possible—I may at least succeed in silencing some objections and

lessening some prejudices, which keep you from the faith.

We have looked long enough at the dark and sorrowful side of the problem before us; let us now turn to its bright and consoling aspect.

IV.

ONENESS IN REDEMPTION.

I AFFIRM once again that it is impossible for us to conceive of the life of society or of humanity apart from the law of solidarity. Let us take a few illustrations, and first from the most simple and primitive form of social life—the family.

We will suppose two men, both born to sorrow, inheriting from their parents unsound constitutions, a sullied name, and the results of years of sin and improvidence. Arrived at man's estate, the one says, "Why should I be responsible for a position in which I never placed myself? Why should I bear the burden of faults in which I had no part? Why should I not have my due of freedom and independence?" Acting out these principles, he casts off his family and repudiates his name. The other accepts his lot; and bowing under the burden laid upon him, he shares with those belonging to him the hard-won fruits of his honourable toil. Now I appeal to the judgment of my readers: Which is the nobler man? Unquestionably, he who obeys without cavilling the law of solidarity. If our hearts could

hesitate a moment, mere reason would tell us, that without this law families could not exist; for the family is not a collection of persons who agree to sit round one hearth and eat at one table; it is not a commercial company, which may become bankrupt or dissolve partnership in critical times; it is a moral fact that cannot be repudiated, a living body, every member of which is bound to guard the life and honour of the whole.

Let us rise a step higher. Above family is country; I picture to myself a country compromised by a rash and wrongful policy. The hour of peril has struck; the land is invaded by foreign armies. Here again are two men. One says, "What have I to do with this cause, which is none of mine? I did not choose my fatherland; and even if I had chosen it, I have had no part in making it what it is." And, consistent with his principles, he renounces, under the fire of the enemy, the national standard. The other, while he deplures the errors against which he had vainly striven, rushes unhesitatingly to the frontier and falls for his country. Which of the two do you esteem the true man? The very question seems an insult. Here again, were it possible for the heart to keep back its utterance, common sense would say, The tie of country is not a bond to be broken, a

factitious compact which may be dissolved at will ; and could it be so regarded, the guarantee of national freedom and self-respect would be withdrawn.

We have before us yet a higher step. Above country is humanity. Let us place ourselves in England in the year 1780. Already it is England, wealthy and victorious, sending out her vessels over all seas to return laden with the treasures of the world. But a whisper is heard, that at the base of this opulence there is an iniquity known as the slave trade. At first no one heeds the muttered words. Why listen? It is true that five hundred leagues away, under the flag of a free and Christian nation, negroes are captured and caged like wild beasts ; it is true that they are shut down under hatchways like so much vile merchandise, and in such numbers that a third of them die of suffocation in every voyage ; it is true that their blood flows under the planter's lash, and their wives and children are sold in open market. But what is that to us? Are we charged with the interests of a race not our own? If it is enslaved, is that our fault? Has it not itself to blame? Can we be expected to sacrifice our interests, our prosperity, our greatness to a cause so chimerical as its elevation? Are we to commence a radical revolution, which will overturn the whole fabric of society?

So spoke the sages and the politicians. But there was a man in the land, young, influential rich, who might have been as eagerly bent as others on the pursuit of his own fortune, but who saw ever before his eyes the fearful scenes enacted in the slave countries. He could not rest. The voice of the oppressor rang day and night in his ears, and moved his Christian heart. The cause of the slaves became his own. Standing at first alone in the midst of ridicule, he consecrated his life to it; and on his death bed, after forty years of strong endeavour, he learned that not only the slave trade but slavery itself was to cease in every land over which floated the banner of England. We ask, Was Wilberforce, the Christian, the Methodist, as he was contemptuously called, in error when he affirmed that the whole family of man is one, and that a wrong done at the ends of the earth concerns us all more or less nearly?

These illustrations suffice to show that the law of solidarity lies at the foundation of all society. Remove it, and progress, education, the family, the race together cease.

If it were indeed possible for us to accept nothing but the consequences of our own acts, what would be the result? We are born into the midst of a society already formed around us. Nature has been subdued

and made to minister to our wants. We find fields tilled, harvests gathered in, paths everywhere prepared for our feet; the walls of home shelter us from the winter frosts. As intellect awakens, we find books waiting to enrich us with the discoveries of sixty centuries; protected from violence and despotism, we are free to seek truth for ourselves, to embrace and proclaim it *at will*.

All these benefits have, as it were, anticipated our coming. What have we done to deserve them? Were we by, when the first pioneers of humanity hollowed the furrows out of which life was to spring? Had we any part in the stern, stiff battles with hostile nature? Have we shared in the sufferings through which all progress, all freedom, has had to be won? Have we agonized with the mighty spirits which have bent over the mysteries of science till they have wrested its secrets from it? Have we passed through their days of toil and wakeful midnight watches? Were we among the witnesses of truth when these had to drink the cup of bitterness and bear the insults and scoffing of the world? or in those silent decisive hours when they had to choose between wrong and death? Has our flesh quivered on the rack? Have we groaned in the dark, poisonous dungeons, alone, rigid with cold, faint, famished,

and with nothing before us but a death of shame and horror? No; but we are the heirs of sixty centuries of such toils and heroic endurance. Every liberty we enjoy has sprung out of ground watered with human life-blood; every blessing we possess is the price of the sacrifice of others. By these terms alone we hold our life, our faith, all that we have, all that we hope for. This solidarity, deemed so repulsive, is the parent of all our good. It is inscribed on every grace and joy of life. Renouncing it, we must needs renounce our place in human kind.

Let us carry our argument still further. In the three examples cited just now, we saw men taking upon themselves the consequences of a condition of things not created by themselves, and we admired them. But in a large and generous heart, one in which love is strong enough for sacrifice, even this is not all. Solidarity in such a heart goes further still. It unites itself to the guilty by a sympathy as real as it is mysterious. It bears the shame of the sinner's sin; it repents with him and for him. Do not all mothers worthy of the name endorse what I say? Does not the fault, the disorderly conduct, the disgrace of a son press upon them with all its weight? Do they even attempt to throw off the load?

Pure as they may be, they feel themselves bound to the guilty one by a link which death alone avails to break. Would they be mothers, indeed, if such sorrow did not abide to the last heart-throb?

Such we conceive to be the sentiment of moral solidarity manifest in the lives of the great heroes of the Bible. The more eminent they themselves are for holiness of life, the more intensely do they realize their oneness with the people whose pastors and priests they are, and take upon themselves the burden of their nation's transgressions and sins. Listen to Abraham interceding on the plains of Mamre for the guilty inhabitants of Sodom and Gomorrah;* to Moses pleading the cause of rebellious Israel;† to Jeremiah,‡ Nehemiah,§ Daniel,|| all identifying themselves in their sublime prayers with their sinning countrymen, and charging themselves with their iniquities. Themselves blameless in the midst of an idolatrous race, they forget their own righteousness while they accept for themselves

* Gen. xviii. 23.

† Exod. xxxii. 31, 32.—“And Moses returned unto the Lord, and said, Oh, this people have sinned a great sin, and have made them gods of gold. Yet now, if Thou wilt forgive their sin—; and if not, blot me, I pray Thee, out of Thy book.”

‡ Lam. iii. 42.

§ Neh. i. 5-11.

|| Dan. ix. 20.

the consequences of the falls and sins of Israel. "We have sinned," they exclaim, "we have transgressed, we have rebelled against Thee; to us belongeth confusion of face because we have sinned against Thee." And St. Paul, last of the heroic line of Scripture heroes, "could wish that he himself were accursed from Christ, for his brethren, his kinsmen according to the flesh." *

If all this be true,—and who can deny it?—I affirm that these special examples of solidarity establish it as a universal fact. If it is possible and right that one should suffer for another, then it is possible that one should suffer for all. If we are bound to love our neighbour as ourself, it is that, in a sense, our neighbour is ourself. † Humanity is not an agglomeration of individual atoms, each possessing an independent life; it is not a mosaic which can be taken to pieces at will; it is not an aggregation of individuals, each of whom may, if he please, isolate himself from the rest and say, "I stand for

* Rom. ix. 3.

† Monsell, "The Religion of Redemption."

I embrace this opportunity to draw attention to this book, from which I have borrowed many of the ideas here worked out. The death of the author prevented him from finishing this remarkable work, of which we have only the first volume.

myself alone." It is a huge tree, and we all are the branches, along which flows the common sap; it is a living body, of which we are truly the members. In my individual life I feel the life of humanity; in my blood, the life-stream of the race. In the history of mankind, the strange secret of my destiny is wrapped up; and as I am involved in its fall, I can be fully raised again only in its restoration.

From the stand-point to which we have now risen, it seems to me we can get a better view of the Christian doctrine of Redemption. A better view, I say, but still imperfect; for, in relation to this, as to the Fall, we have to use the words of St. Paul, "We know but in part," and see only "through a glass darkly." But the dimness is the dimness of the dawn; the faint light will grow into the brightness of the eternal day. Let us then try by it to scan the fact of Redemption.

Eighteen centuries ago a cross was set up, one Friday, on a hill in Judæa; a man was nailed to it, and on it died. At first sight, this is an ordinary event, the like of which history records by thousands. Yet we Christians believe that that day is the central point of history, and to that cross we attach all our hopes of pardon and eternal happiness. And this, be it observed, is not some subtle doctrine, pain-

fully forged by theologic brains ; it is a truth which the most simple and unlearned grasp by an irresistible instinct, which they cling to, whence they derive their strength ; and in the hour of utmost agony, when reason totters on its failing throne, when the shadows of death deepen momentarily, and the gaze of the soul wanders round for one bright central spot on which to rest, it is enough, as the experience of centuries attests, that the cross of the Saviour be held before the closing eyes.

Philosophy is bewildered. What relation can there be, it asks, between that suffering and our salvation ? By what factitious convention can the death of the just save the guilty ? By what judicial fiction can the innocent bear the penalty of the transgressors ? By what further fiction can the transgressors claim a part in the holiness of the innocent ?

Such are the objections raised, to which I reply,—

We are guilty, and God desires to reconcile us to Himself. The point is, How can that reconciliation be effected ? We are told, “God pardons, and that is enough.” And I, on the ground of Scripture, answer, “Yes ; but how does He pardon ?” In order that the reconciliation may be real, worthy of God, who is holy, and of man, whose conscience comprehends what holiness is, two conditions are

essential. First, there must have been reparation on the part of the guilty; next, there must be a change in him. I say, that without these two conditions pardon is impossible. I ask if God can deny Himself, can alter, or lower the law He has given, if He can make our relation to Himself other than a relation of dependence, of obedience, of holiness and love. Now, where that law has been not only violated in its precepts, but utterly forgotten and despised in its very essence; where the creature has treated the Creator as if He had no existence, has lived towards Him in a state of indifference, of forgetfulness, of ingratitude, is it possible that God should just take him back again into His friendship without any reparation of the evil, without any vindication of the holiness of the divine law? No; there must be reparation, and as, by a divine necessity implanted in the conscience, suffering must follow sin, this reparation must be made in suffering.

Reparation! this is the deep need, the constant cry of the soul of man. Of a thousand illustrations which present themselves of the fact, I select only one. When the Archbishop Cranmer was in the power of his enemies, he had the cowardice, in the hope of saving his life, to sign a recantation of his true convictions. After the act was done, he was filled with

penitent remorse; and when, at length, he stood at the fatal stake, and saw the flames leaping around, though they had not yet reached him, he thrust out the hand which had signed the false recantation and held it in the fire till it was consumed, exclaiming, "This hand hath offended; this hand hath offended!" Will any say that the instinct which led him to do so was false? Does not the act rather contain the instinctive avowal, that where the offence has been, there the reparation is due?

In the world, we have face to face God and guilty man; man, I say—not you alone, or I, or any other; it is the whole human race which stands guilty before God. God will proclaim pardon to humanity, but in order that He may do so, humanity must retract its rebellion, and, accepting all the legitimate consequences of evil, must expiate and repudiate it at once. This was done by Jesus Christ, and therefore it is through Him the proclamation of pardon comes. Jesus Christ is, as St. Paul declares, the second Adam. He came to earth that a new race of men might be born to the true life, which consists in communion with God; and as the first condition of this new life must be reparation, He offered reparation for us. Let no one say this was not possible. We showed awhile ago, that no limit could be put to the solidarity

of love. The Eternal Son chose to become the Son of man, bound indissolubly to the destinies of the human race, that He might bring back mankind into the way of life: He chose to become the head, the high priest, the moral centre, and representative of mankind. In Him, to borrow the language of a Christian thinker,* in Him I see the Son of man indeed, one able to feel, to act, to suffer in our stead, as the eye sees, the ear hears, the hand acts for the whole body. Here was a man who fully realized that solidarity which the sublimest sacrifices had till then only faintly set forth. Here was a man who loved every human being as Himself, who sought the happiness, the moral dignity, the holiness of every member of the human family, as He sought His own. Here was a man who realized perfectly the unity and the culpability of the human race, so that the outward ignominy He endured and the anguish of the physical death were but a feeble type of the

* Monsell.— This point of view was admirably presented by Irenæus. He says, “Jesus Christ recapitulated in Himself as it were the whole human race; He was its true head, the representative, not only of all generations, but of all ages.” See the Exposition of the doctrine of Irenæus on Redemption in Vol. V. of “*L’Histoire des trois premiers siècles de l’Église*,” by Dr. E. de Pressensé.

anguish of His soul. He made our sin His own ; He took it upon Himself while His holy soul recoiled from it in horror. He does not look on us with the pitying but powerless sympathy of a stranger ; He truly descended into our hell ; felt all that our sins deserve, and at once confessed and repudiated human sin. He passed through the condition of soul which we all ought to pass through ; He truly bore our whole humanity in His person. In the name of humanity He bowed in humble acquiescence under the condemning stroke ; in the name of humanity He drank the cup of bitterness ; in its name He proved what is meant by separation from God. His dying cry " My God, my God, why hast Thou forsaken me ? " reveals a depth of agony before which we are amazed and tremble. It is the cry of a holy heart, broken for our sins, alike incapable of forsaking us or of suffering itself to be forsaken of God. In the close clasp of love He holds His brethren ; He will not let them go, and with them He sinks into the deep mysterious gulf of condemnation.

Such appears to me the sublimity of the sacrifice, the kingliness of the love of Christ. To the depths of our misery He stooped to seek and win His mediatorial crown. The kings of the earth glory in their lofty isolation ; He found His glory in the

sacrifice of Himself. “*Quo non ascendam?*” whither shall I not rise? exclaimed the greatest minister of modern kings in an hour of intoxication. “Whither shall I not stoop?” says the Lord Jesus; and giving Himself without reserve, He humbled Himself, says St. Paul, even to the death of the cross and to the unimagined bitterness of the curse.

Have we all thus understood the sufferings of our Saviour? If so, what force is there in the objections urged against our redemption by Him? Where is the injustice of the judge punishing the innocent for the guilty? Where the judicial fiction, the factitious convention, of which we hear so much? It was of His own will Jesus suffered. If His sufferings remain a mystery, it is a mystery of love. We should comprehend it, my brethren, if our hearts were large enough to take it in.

One question yet remains to be answered. If I can see how Christ may put Himself in the place of sinful man, I have yet to understand how my salvation is derived from His sufferings and death.

The answer is, By faith. What then is faith? Is it a simple intellectual belief? Is it an operation of the mind? Does salvation by faith mean that we are saved because we believe we are saved? Every one of these questions would probably receive from some

an affirmative answer ; but according to St. Paul, the faith which saves is that act of the soul by which we unite ourselves to Christ, so that, to use another expression of the same apostle, we "grow up into Him in all things." To unite myself to Christ, is to accept His work, so to embrace it with heart and will that that work becomes mine. Is not this in truth, the faith of the Christian ? What will it avail me, that Christ shall have made reparation for all our rebellion, satisfied all the claims of Divine justice, atoned for all our transgressions, if I remain a stranger to Him ? By faith I give in my adherence to the truth embodied in His life and death ; by faith I join myself to the new Adam, the head of a new humanity ; with Him I cancel the fault of our first father, obedience takes the place of rebellion, love of alienation ; with Him and by Him I enter again into fellowship with God. Faith in Christ subdues the pride of my heart, the independent spirit which kept me far from God. It places me towards Him in the attitude of the sinner awaiting all from His forgiving love.

If this be indeed the faith which saves, I ask again: What is there arbitrary in it ? All is moral, all is true, all worthy of God ; and here again, as in the Fall, we find the twofold truth of solidarity and responsibility.

We share in the benefits of that work of expiation which saves us, though we ourselves had no part in it. Were we by, when the Holy and Just One groaned in His soul-anguish in Gethsemane? Had we any part in His final conflict? Did we drink one drop of His cup of agony? Have we felt the burden of the sins of the whole world, and passed through the awful darkness of the Divine indignation against sin? Yet that finished work, that cross, that shed blood, is ours and for us; every Christian feels and owns it to be so. Here then is solidarity.

And yet this work will not profit, will not save us, unless it be accepted by faith; here then is responsibility. It is God who saves; but He does not save us without ourselves. I said, in speaking of the Fall: "We are not condemned for the sin of our first father, except in so far as we have ourselves knowingly and voluntarily ratified it by our own rebellion. In the same manner, in reference to Redemption, I say, We shall not be saved by Jesus Christ, except as we unite ourselves by faith to His redemptive work.

Such is the meaning of salvation by faith, of that doctrine so misapprehended when faith is regarded merely as an act of the reason, but which proves to be the most moral and most sanctifying of all

doctrines, when apprehended as a regenerative act which joins us to Christ; for wherever this faith is real and earnest, the new life is in the germ, the heart is touched, the will changed, and the words of the apostle become a truthful description, "If any man be in Christ, he is a new creature: old things are passed away; behold, all things are become new" (2 Cor. v. 17).

Thus, in the work of redemption, the law of our interwoven life, which before weighed on us like a heavy curse, shines out in brightness and blessing. Jesus Christ has sent streams of life and hope flowing through those arteries of humanity which seemed made to transmit only corruption and death. He has shed the light of love on the oneness of our race, revealing to humanity that it is one family, with one Father in heaven. Before the coming of Christ, men had no such conception. The ancient world was parcelled out among hostile peoples, who regarded all but themselves as barbarians; even in the same nation, the slave and the citizen, the poor and the rich, looked upon each other as irreconcilable enemies. The Indian slept his sleep of death, surrounded by the immutable barriers of caste; none dreamed of a day when, looking round on the whole human family, men would learn to say, "All we are

brethren." I know indeed that some are ready to cite the noble words of Terence: "I am a man, and nothing that is human is strange to me," as a proof that the idea of the oneness of humanity had dawned upon the earth before the day of Christ; but I appeal to all who are familiar with these words in their connection, whether they can fairly bear the large and lofty meaning which in Christian times has been put upon them. Seneca, Pliny the Younger, Epictetus, and Marcus Aurelius are also quoted to prove that the love of humanity existed in the heathen world. But let it be observed, there is a marked and wide difference between these and earlier philosophers, even Cicero himself. As we read Seneca, the most ancient of those I have named (he wrote about A.D. 60), we feel at once the presence of a new principle. Do we then suppose Seneca to have been acquainted with Christianity? By no means, and we reject the ingenious fable of his relations with St. Paul; but without knowing Christianity, Seneca has unquestionably come largely under the influence of the Christian spirit. We cannot forget that thirty years before he wrote, the cross had been lifted up on Calvary; the Church had by this time representatives in every great nation, and the Greek language, which was universally known.

greatly facilitated the propagation of its doctrines. We cannot but suppose, under these circumstances, that men of elevated and thoughtful mind, like Seneca and Pliny, must have marked the nature and progress of the new ideas. Only in this way can we explain some passages in Seneca and Plutarch, and certain biblical expressions which they employ. Cicero would have marvelled greatly at the humane tone in which Pliny the younger speaks about slaves ; and it was assuredly not from mere pagan philosophy that Marcus Aurelius derived his conception of a universal city, of which we are all the inhabitants, of one family whose members are all mankind. For twenty years before he thus wrote, Christians in Rome had embodied this doctrine in their faith and in their lives.

We hold, then, that the truth of the oneness of the great human family was revealed at the cross, and that it was absolutely unknown to the ancient world. It had to assert itself at first amid the scoffs and rebukes of the adversaries of Christianity ; and even in our own day it is but faintly and imperfectly recognised as a practical power. Humiliating it is to confess, that men, refusing to listen to the voice of love, have had to be taught this lesson by the voice of self-interest, the only voice to which the

ear never remains persistently closed. In old times, the life of a nation was confined almost entirely within its own borders; if famine or pestilence came to a land, its inhabitants suffered; but if desolation spread over some remote country, it was nothing to them, unless in the spirit of the old pagans, who imagined that Rome or Athens was the favourite city of the gods, they might bless Providence that their own land was spared. But in our day it is impossible for any people to be unconcerned even in events transpiring at the ends of the earth. Let the Mohammedans in Arabian deserts leave the bodies of the victims offered in sacrifice to rot upon the soil, and lo! the cholera comes to our shores and decimates our cities. Let the question of slavery rend a republic in the New World, and we see our workshops closed, our artisans perishing of hunger. Let there be seasons of exceptional rigour a thousand leagues away, and the price of our corn is raised, and famine threatens our poor. In a word, the whole course of events in our time witnesses to the solidarity of man; and prudent selfishness teaches successfully where charity had failed. Would that the truth thus realized in the practical life of the world, could penetrate the Church, and, in view of its widened and ever widening work, inspire it with a love that

should know no limit, succumb to no obstacle, but steadily pursue its work wherever there is wrong to be righted, misery to be assuaged, a soul to be saved from sin and death!

As men, we have a corporate life, and are bound indissolubly to each other by a law of our very nature. Let us pause a moment over this suggestive thought. Let us catch what it conveys of admonition and comfort.

We have all felt, in days of special joy or sadness, the bond of family life silently drawing our hearts together as we sat round the same fireside; we have all felt the thrill passing through a vast assembly, when every soul has caught the inspiration of a sublime truth or a grand artistic achievement; the sense of isolation is lost in that of a community of life; floods of sympathy overflow the heart and fill it with a mighty joy. Such is the feeling of which I am conscious, when, rising above time and space, I think of the chain which links me to the past. I call to mind all the patient labours, all the heroic sacrifices, which have enlightened, animated, ennobled humanity, since Christ first infused into its languid veins the new life-current of redeeming love. Every blessing I possess, every social and religious liberty, becomes doubly precious as a heritage received from

brethren who bought it with their blood. Let me instance only the Bible, which bears to us the words of eternal life. When I think at what a price of suffering these precious truths have come down through the ages, how many unknown martyrs have held them with dying hands above the flood that would have swept them into oblivion, feelings too big for utterance fill my heart. I see, in the dim dawn of the world, men whose souls bowed like our own before the majesty of Jehovah's name, and who, in an age of corruption and universal idolatry, stood forth as the faithful witnesses of the one living and true God; I catch the mournful accents of the prophets, men of sorrows always, because righteousness had perished from the earth; I mark the inward conflict they sustained, and see them turning their eager gaze to the future, seeking the light they lacked; I follow from age to age the footsteps of those who trod in the track they had marked with blood. At last, I see the cross uplifted, the promise fulfilled, the kingdom of love set up, the salvation of mankind made sure; then I watch the apostles going forth in the power of the cross; I see St. Paul, that great captain of the missionary band, the first to carry the gospel to our pagan forefathers, to proclaim to them the words of freedom and life; I

listen to the worship of the primitive Church, in that spring-time of the Christian life, blossoming in the midst of an accursed world; I hear the hymns of faith and hope rising from the lips of the first martyrs, to be soon drowned in the roaring of the wild beasts of the amphitheatre, then silenced in the dust of death. Ages pass on, and missionaries pierce the dense primeval forests where stand our cities of to-day; I find myself in the Middle Ages, so dark and yet traversed with such luminous shafts of simple, mighty faith, that from the cell of an unknown monk there came forth the holy accents of the "Imitation of Jesus Christ." Then comes the heroic age of the Reformation, when Bible words stir the hearts of the people with a new life, and noble songs of faith arise from new confessors, and the battle for the simple truth is fought again by men grand in the singleness and severity of their lives; these are again the days of great tribulation and of the faith and patience of the saints. Still following down the stream of time, I come to the revival of religion in the last century and in our own; and last of all I find myself, the inheritor of all this glorious past, and bound to it by all that is deepest, holiest, noblest in my being. It is one great spiritual body of which I am truly a member. This unity is no idle dream;

it is a grand reality. Believers of all ages, we are one in our fall and common sufferings, in our repentance and burning tears; one also in our faith and hopes. All that you have thought, felt, suffered, enters into my soul; we have all one life—one in its source, one in its end, one in its ceaseless aspiration after God.

Again I look around me in the present. My thoughts embrace all the children of God scattered abroad over the whole earth; I lose sight of all that divides, to remember only that which makes them one. I think of all believing souls, and of all that would believe, if the truth, as it really is, could pierce the mists of ignorance and prejudice which hang around them. I see those who worship with me in the Father's house, those who are already on their way thither, and those whom the yearning eye of the universal Father discerns coming to Him, though yet afar off. I think of all those honest and true hearts that are turning to God, though as yet they know Him not; of the many who, could they but meet the Christ of the Gospels, would love and serve and worship Him more worthily than we; and between all these souls and my own I feel a bond that cannot be broken. Yes, we are one; my life depends on that of my brethren; and their humblest,

most unobtrusive actions tell with an animating or depressing influence upon me. A missionary breathes out his life in vain, it seems, among the fever swamps of Africa. In vain? Nay, he has by his example shaken me out of my sleep of slothfulness; he has shown me how vain an offering is a ministry of ease and self-indulgence. A poor widow, or a servant, brings me her humble contribution for God's service. I know that she has given, not of her superfluity, but of her necessity; and while she apologizes for the smallness of her gift, I feel she has preached to me that unreserved surrender, which I am so apt to withhold from God. Sometimes even a smaller thing than this,—a word of forgiveness caught in passing, an act of love of which no one will ever hear, or only a look of tender, human kindness, will make sunshine in my soul, darkened by selfishness and worldliness. Who can set limits to the operation of this mysterious law of human inter-action? Can we unveil the secrets of the invisible world? Can we measure the silent but real influences of prayer and a holy life? Do we know by what secret suasion a soul is won for God, or what we owe to those who, far away from us in body, plead for us with many prayers and tears? "The wind bloweth where it listeth," says the Scripture; on its wings it bears

and scatters invisible seeds, which nestle in the earth and blossom in the spring-time. Thus is it with the wind of Grace; none knows all the elements of life and salvation which it brings; none knows what heaven-born flowers may unfold in the eternal spring.

Yet once again I gaze into the future, and think of the law which binds it to the present. I remember that those who will come after us depend on us, that we are preparing their destiny—a law of awful mystery, from which the past, the present, the future, offers no escape! The future is in my hands. There are souls which I may help to save, may help to lose. Ay, which of us has not helped to destroy souls? What came of those old sins of ours? What has been the effect of our ill-gotten wealth, of our unscrupulous dealings with our fellows? Our long years of selfishness, vanity, frivolity, which the world calls charming, what lessons of fruitless living have they taught to others! Hard, bitter words, refusals of kindness, failures in charity, how have these told upon sore and sorrowing hearts? There is something grand in the thought of saving souls; but what influence have we exerted, what lessons have we taught on our passage through life? To what account have we turned the bond between

those souls and ours, which may perhaps have made their eternal destiny dependent upon us?

Strange and solemn thoughts are these, yet only too rapidly effaced from the minds of men by life's striving current. Lest, however, some tender, self-reproachful consciences should be almost overwhelmed with the sense of their responsibility, I would say to them: "Be of good courage; strengthen your hearts." Failure cannot be the ultimate issue of your feeble attempts at good; for all your works, all your sufferings, all your prayers, enter as living stones into the structure of that vast edifice, which is called the Church or saved humanity. Take courage then, members of the body of Christ; you are building for eternity. I see in the future, souls which shall be saved by the devoted service God asks of you today; I see the Church built up by your strong and faithful testimony; I see a spiritual harvest springing out of the furrow which now you are watering with drops of sweat and sorrow. Last of all, I see you yourselves, surrounded by happy souls that pour blessings upon you, received into the fellowship of God, and tasting in His presence the fulness of that life of love, of which, even on earth, you were the witnesses and messengers.

V.

NOTES ON THE SCRIPTURE DOCTRINE OF ORIGINAL SIN.

A. OLD TESTAMENT.

THE Old Testament nowhere treats systematically the question of the origin and nature of evil. But on every page it represents moral evil or sin as a universal fact, as innate in man, and yet contrary to the Divine will. The historical books (Gen. vi. 5 and xi. 3; 1 Kings viii. 46), the Psalms and the Prophets (Ps. xiv. 2, 3; li. 6 and 7; xliii. 2; Jer. xvii. 9), Job (iv. 17-19; ix. 2; xiv. 4; xv. 14; xxv. 4-6), the Proverbs (xx. 9), and Ecclesiastes (vii. 21) all agree on this point.

Some passages in which God is spoken of as urging man on to evil, have been made the basis of a theory, that, in the primitive religious conceptions of the Hebrews, God was the author alike of evil and of good. Such a notion places the primitive religion of Israel lower even than Manicheism, which at least recognised two eternal principles in the world. Let us pass the texts referred to rapidly under review. In Exodus x. 27 we read: "God

hardened Pharaoh's heart;" in Numbers xxii. 20, God is represented as inciting Balaam to disobedience; in 2 Samuel xxiv. 1, God is said to move David to number Israel (in the same narrative, as given in 1 Chron. xxi. 1, this influence is ascribed to Satan). Now on these passages I make the following remarks:—First. In all three cases, Pharaoh, Balaam, and David are held responsible for their sin, and God rebukes and punishes them for it; which, in a psychological point of view, is absolutely incompatible with the notion that He Himself was the determining cause of their fault. Second. In the New Testament, and in the teaching of Christ Himself, we meet with many similar passages, which seem to attribute to God the hardening of men's hearts (Matt. xiii. 13; John xii. 40; Rom. ix.; 1 Peter ii. 8), and yet we are not aware that any are found to maintain that, in the view of Jesus Christ or His Apostles, God is in any degree the author of evil. The explanation of these passages is found in the fact that, according to the Divine plan, evil necessarily produces evil; that one wrong determination gives birth to another; and that, to a sinner walking in the path of transgression, the will of God, which was his good and salvation, is finally fulfilled in his hardening and perdition. The harden-

ing the heart against God is, in the first instance, the act of man's own will; and it is only ultimately that he is made, even by his wilful resistance, to subserve the purposes of God. Pharaoh, in the commencement, hardens himself; subsequently, he is spoken of in Scripture as hardened by God (Exod. vii. 13, 22; viii. 15, 32; compared with ix. 2; x. 20, 27). It is impossible, moreover, for a few isolated passages like these—even could we find no explanation of them—to contradict or enfeeble the one ruling idea of the Bible, which is, that the will of God is the expression of His very nature, and that God, being good, can will only that which is good. “Be ye holy, for I am holy,” etc.

In the third chapter of Genesis we have an account of the entrance of evil into humanity. From this narrative, some of the details of which are clearly symbolical, but which, as a whole, is deeply instructive and suggestive, we derive the following lessons:—

I. God is not the author of sin.

II. Matter is not the source of evil, as was believed by all antiquity.

III. Man is not a development of the lower animals, and evil is not a necessary consequence of the idea of progress.

IV. Man was subjected to an ordeal through which he was designed to rise from a state of innocence to one of voluntary and conscious holiness.

V. Evil already existed outside the human race ; a fall had taken place in the angelic world, and its consequences were felt in the animal kingdom—the serpent was the instrument of the Tempter. This fact explains to us the existence of disorder and death upon earth prior to man's appearance, as it is in our day recorded by science.

VI. The fall of the first pair entails the following consequences upon their posterity : The curse of the earth, work changed into weary toil ; upon woman, the pains and perils of child-birth ; upon all, death.

VII. Death is not the normal condition of humanity ; man was primarily destined for eternal life.

VIII. Evil is to be overcome by the seed of the woman (Gen. iii. 15).

Surprise has been expressed that the canonical books of the Old Testament make no allusion to the narrative of the Creation and the Fall ; and the conclusion has been drawn, that this "myth" of the first three chapters of Genesis was an after-production of the Jewish mind. But it may be observed on this point, that the later books of the Old Testament very rarely allude to those of earlier date. There do

Scripture Doctrine of Original Sin. 73

occur, however, in the Old Testament, passages which necessarily carry us back to the teaching contained in the commencement of Genesis.

Psalm viii., speaking of man, the child of Adam, uses this expression: "Thou hast made him a little lower than the angels, and hast crowned him with glory and honour; thou hast set him over the works of thy hands; thou hast put all things under his feet—all sheep and oxen, yea, and the beasts of the field, the fowl of the air, and the fish of the sea." Here there is an evident allusion to the narrative in Genesis of the creation of man. "Let us make man in our image, after our likeness: and let them have dominion over the fish of the sea, and over the fowl of the air, and over the cattle, and over all the earth" (Gen. i. 26).

Job exclaims (x. 9), "Remember that thou hast made me as the clay; and wilt thou bring me into dust again?" (allusion to Gen. ii. 7: "And the Lord formed man of the dust of the ground;" and iii. 19: "Dust thou art, and unto dust thou shalt return.") Again in Job xxxiii. 4-6 we read: "The Spirit of God hath made me, and the breath of the Almighty hath given me life" (allusion to Gen. ii. 7: "The Lord breathed into man's nostrils the breath of life"). Isaiah lxiv. 8 contains a parallel allusion: "But now,

O Lord, thou art our father ; we are the clay, and thou our potter ; and we all are the work of thy hand." See also Psalm civ. 30. In Isaiah lxxv. 25 we read : "Dust shall be the serpent's meat," alluding, doubtless, to Gen. iii. 14.

In Ecclesiastes iii. 20 we find : "All are of the dust, and all turn to dust again ;" and in xii. 7 : "Then shall the dust return to the earth as it was : and the spirit shall return unto God who gave it."

Again, in Job xxxi. 33, we have an allusion to the story of the Fall : "Have I covered my transgression as Adam?" And in Hosea vi. 7 : "But they like Adam have transgressed the covenant."* It has also been justly observed, that the stereotyped expression of the law of Moses, "dying thou shalt die," is the same as that in Genesis ii. 17.

B. NEW TESTAMENT.

The Teaching of Christ on Original Sin.

Sufficient prominence has not been given to the

* Both these two verses contain the same expression נֶאֱדָם, *like Adam*. Ostervald translates literally the passage in Job, while in that in Hosea he inserts a faulty paraphrase : "They have transgressed my covenant, as if it were a man's." On the other hand, Perret Gentil translates literally the passage in Hosea, and renders Job's words : "Have I covered my faults *after the manner of men?*"

teaching of Jesus Christ on the subject of sin. According to the opinion current in a certain theology, St. Paul was the true creator of the doctrine of original sin; and on this point stands in opposition to his Master, who is said to have taught emphatically the doctrine of the Divine sonship of man. A deeper study of the teaching of Jesus Christ shows how arbitrary and false is this distinction.

Jésus Christ brought out, with a power unknown before, the misery and guilt of man. He shows it thus :—

1. He teaches that man is made to reproduce the moral image of God, and that perfection is his true end.

2. He reveals to the world by His life a type of purity and charity, which conscience acknowledges as its true ideal. All greatness that the earth has seen before, is abased in presence of this new glory of holiness. But the very loftiness of the ideal, by marking the distance which separates us from it, casts a flood of light on our low and fallen state.

3. He shows that moral good or evil consists primarily in the will and intention of the individual; and He thus destroys the Pharisaic casuistry, which, like every other system of casuistry, attached pre-eminence to acts. Christ teaches that

there is adultery in a look of lust, murder in a motion of hatred.

4. To isolated acts He attaches importance only as manifestations of the inward and spiritual condition of the man (comparison of a tree bearing fruit—Matt. vii. 17, 18; xii. 33-35; Luke vi. 43).

5. Now, this inward state is evil. Man, not this or that man, but *man* as such, is diseased (Matt. ix. 12) and evil (vii. 11); he is the slave of sin (John viii. 34); he cannot enter the kingdom of heaven unless born again (ch. iii. 3).

6. The guilt of man is then universal. But it grows with the degree of light enjoyed (Luke xii. 48). He who has beheld the Divine light in its fulness,—that is, he who has looked upon the Son of God, the living image of the Father,—and has rejected Him, has brought himself into condemnation (Matt. x. 15; xi. 24; Mark vi. 11; Luke x. 12; and John iii. 18; viii. 24); and, finally, he who is false to the inner witness of the truth, and who sins against the Holy Ghost, is lost beyond hope (Matt. xii. 31, 32; Luke xii. 10).

7. Jesus Christ constantly represents His work as one of salvation designed for *all men*; those who feel no need of it are, in His view, blindly self-righteous, knowing nothing of themselves.

Teaching of Paul on Original Sin. 77

8. On the origin of evil, Jesus Christ says nothing directly. But on two points He lends the weight of His authority to the teaching of Genesis. He speaks of the tempter as having exercised from the beginning an empire over souls, which constitutes him the prince of this world (John viii. 44 and elsewhere); and of physical death as the consequence of sin and the manifestation of the judgments of God.

On St. Paul's Exposition of the Doctrine of Original Sin.

Although St. Paul expounds the doctrine of original sin with a systematic vigour peculiar to himself, it is to be observed that the other apostolic writers affirm with equal clearness the universality of sin. St. James, for example, who has been represented by some as merely a doctor of the synagogue (see M. Renan), entertains an eminently spiritual idea of the Divine law, and one altogether opposed to Pharisaism. It is James who says: "Whosoever shall keep the whole law, and yet offend in one point, he is guilty of all (ch. ii. 10). This statement clearly implies that, in the view of St. James, individual acts of sin are only the manifestations of a general tendency, which is sin. This is precisely the main idea of St. Paul. St. Peter, though he does not

distinctly state the doctrine of sin, everywhere supposes it as the very condition of the work of redemption, which he presents so clearly in his first Epistle; finally, in St. John, we find not only the clearest allusion to the account of the Fall (1 John ii. 16), but the idea of the universality of sin (id. i. 8, 10), of the bondage which it brings with it, and of the absolute necessity of redemption.

Let us now proceed to sum up as briefly as possible the teaching of St. Paul on this subject, as it appears in its fullest development in the Epistle to the Romans.

St. Paul looks first at sin as a fact. He shows how Jews and Gentiles are equally involved in it, and how both are alike guilty, the one of doing violence to the law written in their conscience, the other to the revealed law. All then are responsible. Sin and guilt are universal facts.

But Paul does not (Rom. iii. 9-19) confine himself to this general view of the outward life of humanity. He demonstrates the fact of sin by the most searching analysis ever made of human nature.

Man, he says, is incapable of righteousness. What is to be understood by this word righteousness? Righteousness is the expression of the normal relation *between the will of man and the will of God.* Sub-

lime thought, which restores to God His central place in the sphere of morality! Ancient philosophers conceived of justice, or righteousness, only as the normal relation of man to man. Paul demonstrates, that by himself man cannot realize perfect righteousness; the law, which should be his rule, serves only to reveal his moral powerlessness and guilt. Man is then incapable of fulfilling his destiny. He possesses no true liberty; he is the slave of sin. [This is the true idea caught in after ages by St. Augustine and by the Reformers, which gives so much power to their theology. The Pauline theology does not, as we shall presently show, absolutely deny free will and liberty of choice. Man has always the will, the choice; but he will not choose that which is good, and is in reality incapable of fulfilling his true vocation; for liberty, in the highest sense, consists in the possibility of realizing the true end of life.]

Sin, then, Paul represents as a principle immanent in human nature, and particular sins are but its outward manifestations (Rom. vii. 8). This principle has its seat in the *flesh*. This does not signify that Paul looks upon matter as the fatal cause of sin; the flesh, in the sense in which he uses it, stands for human nature as a whole, in its state of subserviency to sin. As has been well said, it is not the physical

law of the flesh which becomes sin; on the contrary, it is the law of sin which has become, and which remains, the law of the flesh. Sin precedes in us the moral will. Man has become carnal. It is by the flesh sin still reigns and holds all men in captivity (Rom. vi. 19). Let none be tempted to regard this slavery as a natural, necessary fact. Man has an inward consciousness that it is a malady; he cannot acquiesce in it. The *spirit*, or the Divine principle within him, struggles against the flesh; man is not absolutely evil, for he never loses the sense of his misery. The law, according to Paul's teaching, is designed to give prominence to that misery, by proving to man his own incapacity to attain to righteousness. Thus, unable to justify himself by the law, he may be justified by grace through faith. It is by this truly unanswerable argument St. Paul arrives at the necessity of redemption. This system, founded on the deepest knowledge of human nature, remains eternally true. It rests upon psychological facts, which moral superficiality alone can deny.

Now, it is in the course of this demonstration St. Paul shows how sin entered into the world; and here occurs that famous passage which was the first dogmatic formula of original sin—Rom. v. 12-21.

Perhaps there is scarcely on record an instance of

mistranslation productive of such serious consequences as have arisen out of a false rendering of *v. 12*. The Vulgate, instead of giving "because or for that all have sinned," has translated, *in quo omnes peccaverunt*, "by him in whom all have sinned"; and it is upon this clearly erroneous rendering that Augustine has constructed his peculiar theory of original sin, as an act to be imputed to each one of us. The original $\epsilon\phi' \tilde{\omega}$ cannot grammatically be translated, *in quo*. It signifies literally, *eo quod, propterea quod, quia*, "because," or "since."

It is true that St. Paul seems to contradict himself. On the one hand he teaches clearly that death has passed upon all men in consequence of Adam's fall; on the other hand, he would seem to say that all die because all sin. In order to escape this contradiction, Hoffmann has offered a new, very ingenious, and grammatically justifiable rendering. He connects $\epsilon\phi' \tilde{\omega}$, with *θάνατος*, and translates: "And thus death is transmitted to all men, for under the dominion of death, that is this death, all have sinned." My objection to this rendering of Hoffmann's is, that it is too ingenious and too far-fetched. I prefer leaving $\epsilon\phi' \tilde{\omega}$ in its ordinary sense, which sense, I may observe, is rather one of correlation than of causality. St. Paul does not teach that the death of each individual

is the consequence of his own sin, since he establishes precisely the contrary ; he simply says, that the death brought on by Adam, and passing upon all men, proves that all are sinners, even when they do not sin (children, for example) knowingly and consciously as Adam did.

Let us attempt to state briefly and clearly the teaching really conveyed in this famous passage.

We may observe first, that this is not the only place in which St. Paul establishes a parallel between Adam and Jesus Christ. The same idea occurs again in 1 Cor. xv. 45. In the latter passage, however, the contrasts which the Apostle marks between the two Adams, refer to other points—the body, terrestrial in the one, celestial in the other ; the principle of life, purely psychical in the one, spiritual in the other, etc.

In the passage of the Epistle to the Romans of which we are now treating, St. Paul establishes a double relation, moral and teleological, between Adam and natural humanity on the one hand, and Jesus Christ and redeemed humanity on the other. Adam sinned ; by him sin entered into the world ; all the men who came after him alike sinned. Jesus Christ sinned not ; and those who attach themselves to Him become partakers of His righteousness. Such is the moral relation.

Teaching of Paul on Original Sin. 83

The consequence of Adam's sin was death, which passed with sin upon all his descendants. The death which the first man had merited by the transgression of a positive commandment, he transmitted to all his descendants, *since* (ἐφ' ᾧ) all were involved in a community of sin with him. The second Adam is exempted from death by the absolute absence of sin. This life, which is His due possession, He transmits to those who by faith enter into a community of righteousness with Him.

That which the passage clearly enunciates, therefore, is the fact of a close and intimate solidarity between Adam and natural humanity on the one hand, and Jesus Christ and redeemed humanity on the other. *Solidarity*, I say, not *imputation*. The theology of *imputation* pays no regard to the parallelism here established by the Apostle. When St. Paul says (v. 18) that "by one righteousness, justification unto life came upon all men," it is obvious that he does not intend to affirm that by the righteousness of Jesus Christ *all men are actually justified*. He means, as M. Reuss justly observes, that they are so virtually or conditionally, that is to say, *if they have faith*. In the same manner, the other member of the sentence, "as by one offence judgment came upon all men unto condemnation," cannot

signify simply that all men are condemned for the sin of one, but rather that this sin entails upon them all a similar penalty, *inasmuch as* they are all actually associated in the sin (v. 12). We make the same observation on v. 19. When it is there said, that by the obedience of one all shall be made righteous, it is evident that they will be so only as they enter by faith into fellowship with the obedience of their head; and the same sense must attach to the first member of the sentence, "by one offence all are made sinners." They are declared* or made sinners only in so far as by their acts they have entered into fellowship with the disobedience of Adam. The declaration is in both these cases a judicial act of God, as the word *καθίσταται* so well expresses.—*Reuss.*

I hope I have thus shown that the point of view given in my treatise on Solidarity is strictly scriptural. Let me now add a few remarks on the HISTORICAL FORMATION of the dogma of original sin.

* Ostervald translates "have been rendered sinners" "have been rendered just." *καθίστημι* has both senses: to constitute, in the declarative sense (to declare innocent or guilty), and to constitute, in the actual sense, to *render*. In the latter sense it is employed in 2 Peter i. 18; the former sense is, however, preferable.

History of Dogma of Original Sin. 85

The most ancient Fathers of the Church are unanimous in representing sin, which they regard as opposition to the will of God, as a universal fact, having, as a consequence, the universality of death, which has reigned ever since the fall of Adam. As to the relation subsisting between the sinful state of man and the fall of Adam, they insist upon the fact that sin is a free act, and a simple repetition of the deed of Adam. Justin Martyr, Tatian, Athenagoras, Theophilus of Antioch, Irenæus, Clement of Alexandria, Athanasius, Gregory of Nyssa, Gregory Nazianzen, Chrysostom, Cyril of Jerusalem, and Methodius, all expressed this view. They speak repeatedly of the evil tendency inherent in man, of the power which the devil exercises over him, of a hereditary predisposition to evil; but none of these things nullify, in their view, man's power of free choice. It is evident that none of them had grasped St. Paul's idea in its full depth and breadth. Tertullian teaches more clearly, that there is in man a sinful disposition which is transmitted by generation (*corpus tradux animæ*); but this disposition in no way deprives man of his capacity to do good; it does not make the nature of children corrupt, as he declares in his well-known words with reference to baptism: "*Quid festinat innocens ætas ad remissionem peccatorum?*"

At the same period Origen sustains the Platonic notion, that individual souls, having sinned in a former life, have been for that sin imprisoned in a body and made subject to the corrupting influence of matter.

We note the presence of two ideas in the Christian theology of the first three centuries; in the one, sin is regarded as primarily the result of individual freedom; in the other, as an hereditary fact; and the former view is plainly in the ascendant. This was a natural reaction from the teaching of the Gnostic sects and of Platonic philosophy, which asserted that matter was the source of evil. The Fathers of the Church, in controversion of this view, brought into almost exclusive prominence the responsibility and free agency of man. Moreover minds were not yet much occupied with the problem of evil and of redemption. The Arian disputes were the occasion of the first great theological controversy in the Church. With Pelagius and Augustine a new era commenced.

The Pelagians (Pelagius, Cælestius, and Julian of Ectanum) taught that sin is a free act; man is by nature equally inclined to evil or good; like Adam, he has absolute freedom of choice. If the sin of Adam has any influence over us, it can only be

that of example. Lust (*concupiscentia*) and death are simple natural facts. The only relation subsisting between Adam and ourselves is the relation between the pattern and the copy; the power which sin exerts over us is merely the power of habit.

It was in opposition to Pelagianism that Augustine was led to formulate a complete theory of original sin. The principal points of his system were the following; I. The fall of Adam corrupted his own nature and that of his posterity. II. This corruption (*peccatum originis*) consists essentially in lust—that is to say, in the predominance of the lower, sensual instincts over the spiritual; in the impotence to do good; and in mortality. III. The sinner has lost his liberty, in the higher sense of that word; he has no longer even freedom of choice, since he invariably chooses evil. IV. The state of sin transmitted by birth is not simply evil, but it is imputable to man; it entails the condemnation of all the race, even of children; hence the absolute necessity of the baptism of infants. V. Sin is thus transmitted by generation; and yet Augustine does not, like Tertullian, hold that the soul as well as the body is transmitted by means of generation. He believes that every soul is directly created of God. Hence it follows that original sin is transmitted by the body. VI. He concludes that we all sinned in Adam

(*omnes fuerunt ratione seminis in lumbis Adami*); a conclusion which he justifies by his false translation of Rom. v. 12—*IN QUO omnes peccaverunt*.

Such is the system which gave rise to the ecclesiastical doctrine of original sin. The Catholic Church, however, must not be supposed to have continued faithful to the teachings of St. Augustine. The three greatest representatives of Scholasticism—Anselm, Peter Lombard, Thomas Aquinas—did, it is true, accept his views, though they modified his idea of the total corruption of man, and allowed greater scope to free will. But the Church shows a gradual tendency towards semi-Pelagianism, after condemning it in the two Councils of Orange and of Valence. According to this system, man inherits original sin, and is thus made subject to death; but this sin does not destroy, though it weakens, his power for good; he retains his free will, and he has power to call in to his aid the grace which alone can save him. Duns Scotus went still further, and reduced original sin simply to the loss of original righteousness, which was a superadded gift of God (*donum superadditum*); it follows, therefore, that the nature of man was not changed by original sin, but remains in its integrity. The doctrine of Duns Scotus became, at the Council of Trent, the official doctrine of the Church. “Between

History of Dogma of Original Sin. 89

Adam fallen and Adam before the fall," Cardinal Bellarmine distinctly says, "there is no other difference than between a naked man and a man who has been deprived of his clothing."

The Reformation returned to the doctrine of St. Augustine. That doctrine is found in all the confessions of faith of the sixteenth century; it is that which Jansenius tried to re-establish, and which was solemnly condemned by the Bull *Unigenitus*.

THE END.

New Volume of Dr. Pressensé's HISTORY OF EARLY CHRISTIANITY.

Just published, in 8vo, price 14s., cloth.

THE MARTYRS AND APOLOGISTS. By E. DE
PRESSENSÉ, D.D. Translated by ANNIE HARWOOD.

"In the present work he has had to trace the marvellous way in which Christianity gradually sapped and undermined the old Paganisms, seeming to assimilate to itself what little of human and noble was left in them, and to dignify that anew. And the author has done his work with rare artistic power. It is altogether a masterly book, and is translated into elegant, vigorous English."—*Daily Telegraph*.

"We commend this very instructive, eloquent, and fascinating book to all who care to know how the forms of Christian life which fill eighteen centuries had their origin. Once taken up, they will find it difficult to lay it down. Miss Harwood has achieved the translation with great care and ability. She has admirably preserved the vivacity and antithesis of M. de Pressensé's style."—*British Quarterly Review*.

"A volume of this honest, genuine, and manly tone is sure of a hearty welcome from all who wish well to the cause of Christianity. We gladly commend it as well worthy of most careful study."—*Standard*.

"A most fascinating and trustworthy history of the struggles of the early Church, narrated in a style of lofty and impassioned eloquence, and untinged by any sectarian bias from beginning to end."—*English Churchman*.

By the same Author.

THE EARLY YEARS OF CHRISTIANITY.
8vo, 12s., cloth.

"This is a sequel to Dr. Pressensé's celebrated book on the 'Life, Work and Times of Jesus Christ.' We may say at once that to the bulk of liberal Christians, Dr. Pressensé's achievement will be very valuable."—*Athenæum*.

By the same Author.

**JESUS CHRIST: HIS LIFE, TIMES, AND
WORK.** Fourth and Cheaper Edition. Crown 8vo,
9s., cloth.

"The successive scenes and teachings of our Lord's life are told with a scholarly accuracy and a glowing and devout eloquence, which are well presented to the English reader in Miss Harwood's admirable translation."—*British Quarterly Review*.

A Smaller Edition is now ready, entitled:—

JESUS CHRIST: HIS LIFE AND WORK.
Small crown 8vo, 5s., cloth.

EXTRACT FROM THE AUTHOR'S PREFACE.

"This popular Edition of my Life of Christ differs from the work which I published nearly a year ago (and which in eight months reached its third edition), by the absence of all that was purely scientific. It appeared to me desirable in this edition, which addresses itself to the most various classes of readers, to avoid as far as possible all debatable and controversial points. I hope that in this new form, this book, in which I have embodied my most cherished convictions, will meet with a wide circulation."

London: HODDER & STOUGHTON, 27, Paternoster Row.

Recent Works in Theology.

THE THEOLOGY OF THE NEW TESTAMENT.

A Handbook for Bible Students. By J. J. VAN OOSTERZEE, D.D., Professor of Theology in the University of Utrecht. Crown 8vo, 6s., cloth.

"An excellent manual. The scientific method on which it is constructed, the lucidity of its arrangement, the sagacity and abundance of information which is brought to bear in it on the work of interpretation, call for the highest praise."—*Spectator*.

PHENICIA AND ISRAEL: The Burney Prize Essay in the University of Cambridge for 1870. By AUGUSTUS, S. WILKINS, M.A., Professor of Latin in Owen's Colleges Manchester, Author of "The Light of the World," &c. Crown 8vo, 5s., cloth.

HUMAN POWER IN THE DIVINE LIFE; or, The Active Powers of the Mind in Relation to Religion. By the Rev. NICHOLAS BISHOP, M.A. Crown 8vo, 6s., cloth.

"The work is full of vigorous thoughts on vital topics, set forth in language clear, fresh, and strong."—*Homilist*.

LECTURES ON THE FIRST AND SECOND EPISTLES OF PETER. By JOHN LILLIE, D.D. With a Preface by PHILIP SCHAFF, D.D. 8vo, 12s., cloth.

MODERN SCEPTICISM. A Course of Lectures delivered at the Request of the Christian Evidence Society. With an Explanatory Paper by the Right Rev. C. J. ELLICOTT, D.D., Lord Bishop of Gloucester and Bristol. Third Edition, crown 8vo, 7s. 6d., cloth.

FIRST PRINCIPLES OF ECCLESIASTICAL TRUTH: Essays on the Church and Society. By J. BALDWIN BROWN, B.A. In 8vo, 10s. 6d., cloth.

"This able, thoughtful, and most sincere book."—*Spectator*.

ST. MARK'S GOSPEL. A New Translation, with Notes and Practical Lessons. By Professor J. H. GODWIN, New College. 4s. 6d.

THE TEN COMMANDMENTS. By R. W. DALE, M.A. Third Edition, small crown 8vo, 3s. 6d., cloth.

"The simple, nervous, lucid style, the clear discrimination, the pointed, practical faithfulness, and especially the manly, fearless honesty of Mr. Dale's expositions, demand the very highest eulogy."—*British Quarterly Review*.

By the same Author.

THE JEWISH TEMPLE AND THE CHRISTIAN CHURCH. A series of Discourses on the Epistle to the Hebrews. Second Edition, crown 8vo, 6s., cloth.

London: HODDER & STOUGHTON, 27, Paternoster Row.

Princeton Theological Seminary-Speer Library



1 1012 01023 2611